

fact, it is what the entire world expects of us, nothing less.

IMMIGRATION AND PROTECTION OF OUR BORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Michigan). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, let me say first of all that as I sat here and observed and listened to the comments of my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS), I am taken with the profound nature and the fact that he has for quite some time been a consistent and articulate spokesman for the concept of a missile defense system, which I certainly agree with him now increases in terms of its importance in the context of the defense of the Nation.

I hope he continues to speak on this issue. I hope he continues to be the sort of advance guard for this concept, because, of course, it is one that is being criticized by our opponents. And it needs people like my colleague to defend it.

It is striking because, from my own point of view, it is in a way a metaphor for what I want to talk about tonight. The gentleman talks about the danger we face, among other things, and this was just a part of his presentation, but he was talking about the danger this Nation faces from an outside source, from something coming in, crossing our borders, and attacking our cities. And he talks about the need of the United States to prepare some sort of defense against it. I certainly agree with him that that need is great. But it is a metaphor, as I say, for what I wanted to discuss tonight because I believe the issue of something outside of the United States, or somebody, in my case, outside the United States becoming a dangerous missile directed in our direction.

Whether in the form of a huge massive piece of steel or in the form of an individual who is willing to give his or her life turning an airplane into a missile, the fact is we must protect our borders. We must defend the Nation against these outside incursions. And although I totally and completely support the idea of a missile defense shield, I must add that there is another thing that we are responsible for here in this Congress, something that we are uniquely responsible for in the Congress of the United States, something no State can individually take on for itself, just as they cannot take on the defense of the country individually State by State, but that they rely upon the Federal Government for that purpose, and that is the Federal Government is solely responsible for the control of our borders, for the control of immigration across those borders.

States cannot in any way, shape, or form manage that problem. It is not delegated to them in the Constitution as a responsibility. And, of course, it is not realistic to think that they could take that responsibility on. It is uniquely this body, the Congress of the United States, and the President that have the ability to control that process, entrance into the United States of America.

And what more do we need to know? How much more do we have to see before we come to the conclusion that what we have been doing for the last 20 or 25 years in terms of protecting our borders has simply failed us? The people that took over the planes, the people that did all the preparation, the people that did all the planning, all the cells that are operating inside the United States, or those of which we know anyway and those that have been made public, all of them had as members people who were foreigners to the United States, people who were here on various types of visas or, in some way or other, had come into the United States; but they were not citizens of the United States. They had come across our borders for the purpose of doing us harm. And we allowed them to come across the borders. And we allowed them to stay here, even though, by the way, some of them had given us cause to be concerned.

□ 2230

In a recent article appearing in the New York Times, of all publications, September 27, the headline is "Suspects in Hijackings Exploited Loopholes in Immigration Policy."

The article goes on to describe, it says,

For Hani Hanjour, identified as the pilot who flew the jet that rammed into the Pentagon, blending into the American landscape began in Saudi Arabia with a \$110 application for a four week English course in California. He had only to prove that he had \$2,285 to pay for the lessons along with room and board. He never turned up for class. Two other men the authorities said plowed jetliners into the World Trade Center, Mohamed Atta and Marwan al-Shehhi, entered the United States on tourist visas. Even without the required student visa, the men studied at the flight school in Florida.

Counselor officers deluged with visa applications say they generally do not have much time to investigate the applicants. Once foreign visitors enter the United States, immigration officers and law enforcement agencies usually have no idea if they are complying with the terms of their visas. United States Immigration officials said the hijackers exploited an immigration system that critics contend is riddled with loopholes.

I am certainly one of those critics and have made my concerns with regard to this particular problem known for many months here on the floor of the House.

Until September 11, that system was geared to ease the way for commerce, whether in the form of tourism, busi-

ness or study. Experts on tourism said that security precautions often took a back seat to pressures from industry, the concerns of neighboring governments, and even bureaucratic rivalries in the United States Government.

According to the State Department manual for counselor affairs, participating in the planning or execution of terrorist acts would bar a foreigner from getting a visa, but "mere membership in a recognized terrorist group would not automatically disqualify a person from entering the United States, nor would the advocacy of terrorism disqualify a person from coming into the United States."

I could go to an embassy in Saudi Arabia, in Syria, in Iran; and I could apply for a visa to the United States, and I could list my membership in a wide variety of terrorist organizations, terrorist organizations that had called for the kind of thing that happened on September 11. But the visa officer in those embassies would not be able to exclude me, would not be able to stop me under the present system of immigration laws we have in the United States from coming here.

If this is not unbelievable to you, Mr. Speaker, I cannot imagine what we can say that could more clearly define the problem than this.

The manual, apparently unchanged since September 11, says that the United States will exclude immigrants who incite for direct terrorist activity but that statements of a general nature that do not directly advance specific acts of terrorism are not automatically a basis for exclusion. Some American investigators have said they believed Mr. Atta, the apparent mastermind of the group, belonged to the Egyptian Islamic jihad, and that he met with Iraqi intelligence officers this year. He apparently entered on valid visas and may have even reentered the country after overstaying his visa on his last trip to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, approximately 30 million people obtain visas to visit the United States every year. Thirty million people come into this country via visas every year. Most of them of course are on tourist visas. Some are on business and education-related visas, but 30 million come in. We have some approximation; we think we have a handle on how many overstay or violate their visas, and it runs at about 40 to 45 percent. So that means that 12, 13, 14 million people a year come into the United States, ignore the visa requirements, and simply stay.

Do you know what happens to them, Mr. Speaker? You know one of the reasons why such a high percentage of these people can and do violate their visa regulations? It is because nobody cares. It is because no one will take any action against them.

The INS will say that it is an overwhelming job for which they are not

sufficiently funded. Perhaps so. It is also true that the INS could not care less about the people who overstay their visas. There is a culture, a way of thinking in the INS, I do not know if it is still there after September 11, but I can guarantee you it was there before then and I think it is still there now, that encourages and it essentially abets the criminals who come into the United States, who come in illegally to begin their stay here or eventually become illegal because they overstay their visas. The INS does not care. It is of no consequence to them. In fact, they want to encourage it.

Mr. Speaker, I was actually in a debate on the radio with a lady who was the regional officer in the Colorado area for the INS. She may have been the public affairs person. She was asked by the host of the program I was on, why is it that the INS does not actually arrest and deport all of the people who are here illegally? Why do they not essentially find them, round them up and send them out of the country? I thought it was a very logical question. By the way, this was before September 11. And she said because that is not our job. She said the INS, it is not our responsibility to deport people who are here illegally. Our job is to figure out a way to get them legalized. I have no idea where she read that, what particular set of rules or regulations or under what law she interpreted her role as an INS agent as simply helping everyone in the world become a U.S. citizen. I suggest that is an inaccurate observation on her part.

It is the case that most people in the INS, many, I should say, many people in the INS have that same sort of idea. They are infused with this concept of open borders. They believe their real task is to get as many people in here as possible, get them legalized, and have them eventually become citizens of the United States. That is not what I consider their role, but that is what they consider their role. They ignore the 12 to 15 million people who overstay their visas. Nobody checks into it. Hence, we end up with people like the ones that I have just identified who became the hijackers and took the lives of thousands of Americans. They had overstayed their visas, many of them. Nobody cared. Nobody checked.

Mr. Speaker, this issue of our ability to control our own borders is extraordinarily important from my point of view. It is true that I have been on this floor many, many hours in defense of a policy that would protect our borders, defend our borders, help us determine who comes in and how long they stay. The right, not just the right but the responsibility of every nation on this planet is to do just what I have described, protect and defend their own borders. Most nations do so, and we do not begrudge them that. Mexico does so. Not 2 months ago Mexico decided to

once again put Federal troops, Mexican Federal troops on their southern border with Guatemala. Right before President Fox came here to ask the United States to essentially open our southern border, he made a decision about what was good for Mexico; and he determined that the large number of people coming across the border, the low-skilled people, were causing an economic drain for the Mexican Government, and he determined to put a stop to it.

This is not the first time Mexico made that decision. Mexico in the past essentially rounded up immigrants illegally coming into their country, and I mean that in the literal sense, put them in detention camps or sent them north to get them out of Mexico. Yet the President of Mexico comes here and says it is our responsibility to open our border to his people, to his unemployed because, of course, they choose not to deal with the horrific economic problem and social problems that beset that nation. They would rather have the United States be the sort of safety valve that they need to keep their people moving north and sending money south.

Mr. Speaker, no one is suggesting, certainly I am not suggesting that the events of September 11 were the responsibility of Mexican immigrants. They certainly were not. They were the direct actions taken by people from the Middle East. But my point is this: we must do everything we can to seal our borders except to those people we determine need to and legitimately have a reason to come into the United States. Just because one of those borders happens to be between the United States and Mexico is not the point. It is not anti-Mexican to suggest that we need to deal with the border any more than it is anti-Canadian to say that we must deal with the issue of a porous border on our northern frontier. It does not matter which country we are separating ourselves from, it is the function of this government, it is the legitimate function of this government to in fact ensure the domestic tranquility and provide for the common defense. That means, among other things, the defense of our borders.

Going back to the article that was in the New York Times, it said, "In spite of elaborate immigration laws and the efforts of the INS," which is almost a joke, "the United States is de facto a country of open borders, the National Commission on Terrorism said in a report last year." It is that same report that we now hear spoken of widely as being prophetic. It is that same report that people refer to constantly and say why did we not pay attention. To Mr. Rudman and others who were the authors of the report when they gave it to us, a relatively short time ago, but even before that we had warnings.

In earlier reports, in 1997 we had the Jordan Commission Report. The late

Barbara Jordan was not considered to be a raving conservative with attitudes so anachronistic in nature. Barbara Jordan was a very outspoken, very articulate, very liberal individual, politically speaking. It was the report she commissioned that talked about the dangerous nature of our porous borders. It talked about a whole bunch of interesting issues, and I certainly commend it to anyone for their review.

□ 2245

If they think that this issue is simply one of those right-wing conservative, white men issues, Barbara Jordan, an African American, who understood the problems and the dangers we face in this Nation as a result of massive immigration, legal and illegal, as a result of having borders that are completely and totally porous as a result of being unable to defend ourselves and unwilling to defend ourselves in that particular way.

Mr. Speaker, I find myself in a dilemma. It is one with which I have dealt for some time, and it is this: I know that a huge majority, somewhere 75 to 80 percent of the people of this Nation, support our point of view vis-à-vis immigration and immigration reform. A huge majority of the people of this Nation believe that we should reduce immigration, that we should gain control of our borders, that we should do something to stop the flow of illegal immigrants into this country, that we should do something to make sure we know what people who are here on visas are in fact doing. That we in the United States and the Federal Government should take on our responsibility to protect and defend this Nation by protecting and defending its borders.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that a huge majority of Americans agree with this point of view. Believe me, I hear from them. And the dilemma is this: How is it that we can have 75 to 80 percent of the population agreeing that we have to reform our immigration laws and do something to tighten up on the way in which people are able to obtain entrance into this country, why is it that that is the case and that this body is unable or unwilling to reflect that point of view? How is it, Mr. Speaker, that even in light of the events of September 11, that we have a situation where when the administration comes forward with a bill that has relatively few points dealing with immigration and visas, even those points are watered down?

I saw today in the paper that this House, somehow it said, the House has agreed on a new antiterrorism bill. Now, no one has asked me about that yet, but it does not matter, the leadership evidently in both the House and the Senate have come to some conclusion about what the antiterrorism bill should include. And when it got down to the point about immigration, it

talked about how watered down that bill had become. It talked about the fact that one of the provisions that was stricken from the measure was the ability to detain people who were here, aliens who were here because we believe that they are connected to some terrorist organization, now we have only a certain period of time and they can go to court, all the rest of the stuff.

Amazing, Mr. Speaker. Absolutely amazing. We act as though, and we talk as though these people who have come here from foreign countries, whether for good intentions or ill, we talk as though they are American citizens, with the same rights as an American citizen.

Mr. Speaker, they are not, by definition, American citizens. They do not enjoy the same rights as American citizens. Just simply being here, simply being within the, quote, borders of the United States, existing here does not confer upon you any of the rights guaranteed in the Constitution. There are some liberal judges who have interpreted this differently, but I suggest they are incorrect in their analysis. I suggest that if we do not say that there is a difference between people who come here and simply get across the border and exist here and those of us born here or obtain legal citizenship status, if there is no difference, then why do we even have the concept of citizenship? Why do we go through the process of having people raise their hand at a point in time when they come across the borders and swear allegiance to the United States and confer upon them citizenship? What does it matter? Why do we not just end the charade and say if you are here, if you have made it across our borders somehow, you get all of the same benefits as a citizen?

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that that is what the founders of the Nation intended. And as a result of the fact that the people to whom we are focusing on, whom we are focusing our issue here tonight and were part of the antiterrorism bill, they were not and are not citizens of the United States and, therefore, have absolutely no, quote-unquote, right to any of the protections that the immigration lawyers and our friends on the other side of the aisle forced into this package. But that is the extent to which we in this body have sunk. We are unwilling to confront the proponents of open borders. We are perhaps even willing to risk the security of this Nation in order to gain a political advantage, a political advantage that would accrue to one party who would gain the votes of these people who eventually became citizens.

Now, that is a pretty cynical analysis, but, Mr. Speaker, I cannot, for the life of me, think of what in the world it is other than a cynical reason employed to stop and water down the

antiterrorism bill in the area of immigration reform. It is truly amazing. It is almost beyond belief that this could happen today. But it goes to show you the dilemma, the nature of the dilemma that I referred to earlier.

What do I do, Mr. Speaker? What can I do other than what I have been doing, to take this floor at every opportunity, to express myself as clearly as I possibly can about the nature of the danger, about the nature of our responsibility in the face of that danger?

How much more can I say than has been said? How much more of a statement can I make than was made on September 11 to convince my colleagues that something significant has to change in the way of immigration reform? That is why I take this floor as often as I can and address those who may be listening, Mr. Speaker, and others for the purpose of trying to convince them that pure partisan political motives sink below anything that we believe can and should be done in this body to advance the American cause. I cannot think of any other reason why we are so unwilling to deal with this issue of immigration reform.

Even the administration's bill, the original bill, did not go far enough as far as I am concerned, certainly. We should, in fact, impose a moratorium on all immigration for at least 6 months, except for cases of national security. We should give our agencies, the INS, the FBI, immigration authorities throughout the country, we should give them the opportunity to reform themselves, to reconstruct themselves into a true immigration control agency. We cannot do that with something near 300 million people crossing the border, 300 million people annually crossing the border between the United States and Mexico. We cannot do that with 30 million visas being given every single year.

Let me talk for just a second about one special kind of visa, by the way, called diversity visas. We came up with these in the early 1900s and we said, you know, there are some countries that just are not sending enough people, some countries from which we are not getting quite enough immigration. And so we are going to give them a special place in line. We are going to set aside 50,000 diversity visas for these countries, and they are, among others, Egypt, Syria, Libya, they are countries throughout the Middle East who benefit from diversity visas. Now, I have no idea if any of the hijackers were recipients of diversity visas, but I have to ask if this is one of those things we are going to hang on to because of some sort of politically correct concept about who should be able to come into the United States.

Mr. Speaker, before September 11, there were many people who would even actually openly state that it was their desire to see open borders, not

just between the United States and Mexico, the United States and Canada, but open borders throughout the world and that we should be sort of the fore-runner in that.

You do not hear them anymore. They do not stand up on the floor of this House. They do not even write editorials in the Wall Street Journal anymore. Cato Institute, a very powerful, very influential, libertarian-oriented think tank here in the United States, has for years pushed the idea of open borders. Even they have been, interestingly, quiet in recent weeks. Nobody thinks it is a good idea anymore, Mr. Speaker, to simply walk away from the borders and let anyone walk into this country at any time, stay for as long as they like, do whatever they want, and leave. Nobody thinks that that is judicious.

Well, interestingly, we are still at that point, even after the 11th of September. We are still there. That can still happen. And although people do not take the floor to attack the idea of open borders anymore, they still want it. They still advocate the concept, they just cannot do it openly, for fear of the political and social retribution that would be heaped upon them, and deservedly so.

There is another article to which I wish to refer this evening. It is written by a lady by the name of Ann Coulter, opinion editorial.

She says:

"After the World Trade Center was bombed by Islamic fundamentalists in 1993, the country quickly chalked it up to a zany one-time attack and 5 minutes later decided we were all safe again. We weren't then. We aren't now. They will strike again. Perhaps they will wait another 8 years. Perhaps not. The enemy is in this country right now. And any terrorists who are not already here are free to emigrate. The government has been doing an excellent job in rounding up suspects from the last two attacks. But what about the next attack? We thought there was only one murderous Islamic cell in America the last time. Incorrect. Congress has the authority to pass a law tomorrow requiring aliens from suspect countries to leave. As far as the Constitution is concerned," she says, "aliens, which is to say any noncitizen, are here at this country's pleasure. They have no constitutional right to be here. Congress has, within its power, the ability to prevent the next attack, but it won't," she says. "When the Sears Tower is attacked, the President is assassinated, St. Patrick's Cathedral is vaporized, anthrax is released in the subway systems or Disneyland is nuked, remember, Congress could have stopped it but it didn't. Pious invocations of the Japanese internment are absurd. For one thing, those were U.S. citizens. Citizens cannot be deported."

So far, thank God, almost all the mass murderers of Americans have

been aliens. But even more blindingly obvious," she says, "there was no evidence that the attack on Pearl Harbor was staged by Japanese saboteurs living in California. The Japanese internment was a pure land grab implemented by liberal politicians, President Franklin Roosevelt," and she mentions others here, Governor Warren.

□ 2300

"The internment was vigorously opposed by J. Edgar Hoover. This time, the very nature of the enemy is that they have infiltrated this country and passed themselves off as law-abiding, quiet immigrants. The entire modus operandi of this enemy is to smuggle mass murderers to our shores. But the country refuses to respond rationally. Rather, Congress is busily contemplating a series of 'anti-terrorism measures,' most notable for their utter irrelevance to the threat. What precisely would a national ID card accomplish? The hijackers were in this country illegally. A few may have overstayed their visas by a few days, a minor bureaucratic oversight that they surely would have remedied had they not been about to commit suicide in a monstrous attack. One member of the other body," she said, "has bravely proposed that we take the aggressive step of asking aliens in the country to register periodically with the government so we know where they are. That is already the law in Germany. Several of the hijackers in this attack lived in Hamburg. They obediently complied. The mastermind of the most vicious attack in the history of the world, Mohamed Atta, was in Florida on a 'vocational status visa' in order to attend flight school. Let's say Atta had registered. Now what?

"As the entire country has been repeatedly lectured, most Muslims ever amazingly peaceful, deeply religious, wouldn't hurt a fly. Indeed, endless invocations of the pacific nature of most Muslims is the only free speech it is safe to engage in these days. This is a preposterous irrelevancy. Fine. We get it.

"The New York Times can rest assured that every last American has now heard the news that not all Muslims are terrorists. But that is not the point. Not all Muslims may be terrorists, but all the terrorists are Muslims, at least all terrorists capable of assembling a murderous plot against America that leaves 7,000 people dead in under 2 hours.

"How are we to distinguish the peaceful Muslims from the fanatical homicidal Muslims about to murder thousands of our fellow citizens? Are the good Muslims the ones that live quiet lives, pray a lot and obey the laws? So do the architects of Bloody Tuesday's mass murder. Are the peaceful Muslims the ones that loudly pro-

claim their hatred of Osama bin Laden? Mohamed Atta did that too.

"The only thing we know about them, other than they live among us, is that they are foreign-born and they are Muslims. The government has been remarkably tight-lipped about precisely how many Muslim visitors we are currently accommodating, but from unofficial estimates there appears to be more than 1 million. Even if the Attorney General instigated latter day Palmer raids, it will take years and years to investigate and infiltrate every potential terrorist cell operating on our shores.

"The investigation should not be conducted while the enemy continues residing here, plotting the next attack. It is an extreme measure," she says, "but we face an extreme threat. It is suicidally naive to think we can simply seal off every water supply, all the air vents, food supply and crop dusters from now until the end of time. We cannot search every truck, every passenger, every shopper, every subway, every person entering every building, every American every day. It is impossible to stop Islamic fundamentalists who think that slaughtering thousands of innocent Americans will send them straight to Allah. All we can do is politely ask aliens from suspect nations to leave," she says, "with full expectation of readmittance while we sort the peace-loving immigrants from the murderous fanatics.

"More benefits of the plan next week, but the beauty part of the terrorist deportation plan can't wait. There will be two fail safes. One, Muslim immigrants who agree to spy on the millions of Muslim citizens unaffected by the deportation order can stay, and, two, any Muslim immigrant who gets a U.S. Senator to waive his deportation by name gets to stay.

"This is brutally unfair to Muslim immigrants who do not want to kill us, but it is not our fault. It is the fault of the terrorists who are using their fellow Muslims as human shields. So far, America's response to a calculatingly cold-blooded enemy has been to say, excuse me, you seem to have dropped your box cutter."

Now, Ms. Coulter's observations are just that, her observations. She is, of course, free to state them. And they are harsh, and I doubt for a second that this body would ever consider such an action as deporting all people who are here as immigrants and who are Muslims.

We are not going to do it, and whether that is good or bad I will leave up to the observer. But I will say this, that there are many things we have an absolute right and ultimate responsibility to do. Putting troops on our border, a scary proposition for some, an absolutely logical one for me. Also, I might add, Mr. Speaker, a logical one for a majority of Americans. They agree it should be done.

The purpose of the military is to defend our borders. We know where our borders are. Let us send them there. We cannot depend upon the INS to protect us. We cannot depend upon the INS to keep people out of the United States who should not come. We cannot depend on the INS to enforce our own laws.

An amazing thing I was told earlier this evening, there are literally hundreds of thousands of orders that have been issued by judges, by immigration judges in this country; orders for the deportation of immigrants who have violated a law, who have come here illegally, or while here have violated some law or have overstayed their visas. Hundreds of thousands of these orders have been issued in the last few years. Yet few, if any, have actually been carried out by the INS.

When the judge raps his or her gavel and says you have been found guilty of violating the law and I hereby issue an order to deport you, that person can simply laugh at the judge, turn around and walk away. We do not hold them, and we do not go after them.

Now, they can in fact enter an appeal. We do not know exactly how many have done that, but we do know that many have done that and again walked away. We are going to try to find out those numbers, but the INS is very tight-lipped about these things.

Literally hundreds of thousands of people have actually put up bond, put up bail, and walked away. They have committed crimes. Some of these crimes are far more serious than simply overstaying their visa or entering the country illegally. Some of these are felonies, and yet the people walk away, because right now the law allows them to do so. And there are literally hundreds, if not thousands, of frustrated Americans serving in the capacity of judges and honest immigration officers who are incredibly frustrated by their inability to stop the ocean with the sieve that we have given them.

We could do something about that tomorrow. We could determine how many people are out there who have skipped out on bail, who have simply walked away from court orders deporting them and have never been looked for by the INS. The INS will tell you that it is a resource issue, but it is more than that, Mr. Speaker. They do not want to look. They do not care.

Some of the time I am told that in some of these cases that come in front of these judges that I have referred to, the immigration lawyer, the lawyer for the government, is actually half the time defending the perpetrator, the plaintiff. And to the judges even, this seems odd and almost incredible, but it is what has happened. For years we did not pay the slightest bit of attention to it. As I say, I and others could get

up on this floor and speak to our concerns about immigration, and people really would not want to hear it.

□ 2310

Because no one wants to be considered to be racist or xenophobic, and I certainly do not believe that I fall into either of those two categories. I know that I do not. No one wants to be called those things, and so everybody avoided the discussion of the issue of immigration.

It is too late for us really, in a way. But at least we must now do everything we can, as I said earlier, if it is building a missile defense system, that is fine; but let us do something before it gets here, before that missile or before anyone with the intent of destroying the United States and everything we stand for. Let us do something about it. Even Ms. Coulter suggested, after her rather Draconian measure is employed, to send, to return all Muslims, to send them all out of the United States, she agrees that they should be allowed to come back in, once some sort of detection mechanism has been set up, once some sort of a system is set up to see if they should be allowed in. I am not advocating that at all. All I am saying is that some measure has to be employed here, some rational approach has to be adopted by this House and by the Senate and signed by the President to deal with this issue of immigration in the poorest nature at our borders.

I do not know, as I say, what more we can possibly add to this case that we are making in front of the people of the United States. I do know this, Mr. Speaker, that unless the people of the United States let their elected representatives know how they feel about this issue, things will not change.

There is a strong lobby here in the Congress of the United States against any immigration reform. It is led oftentimes by immigration lawyers who make their living, of course, out of making sure that we have open borders or at least pursue a policy, a *de facto* policy, of open borders. Then there is, of course, a large number of people who simply believe in that concept philosophically; they adhere to it. Even if they are out of touch with their constituents, they are going to vote that way, Mr. Speaker, we both know this, unless they hear from those constituents.

That is why when I say I have a dilemma, it is in knowing exactly how to deal with the fact of the incredible irony, if you will, the fact that a huge percentage of the population by every poll agrees with the point of view that I have established here tonight, that some form of immigration reform is necessary, that we should limit the number of people coming into the United States far lower than it is today at a million and a quarter or so legally,

and maybe twice or three times that many annually coming, into the United States illegally. People want that reduced. They want illegal immigration stopped. They want us to deal with those people who are here illegally. They do not want them employed.

Certainly, there are a lot of employers who understand the fact that it is good business to pay people maybe even less than the going wage, maybe even less than minimum wage, exploit them because they are here illegally, knowing that they cannot do anything about it. Yes, I know there are employers of course who do that. But I am telling my colleagues that a majority of Americans want people to enter this country legally, want us to have a fair system that allows for diversity, that allows us to continue to enjoy the benefits of diversity, all of the great things that immigration has provided to the United States.

I would never, ever deny the fact that we are richer as a Nation as a result of the many incredible treasures that have been brought to our shores by immigrants. I do not believe that we should forever end all immigration. I simply ask for us to take a rational approach. Let us pause immigration for at least 6 months, a pause. Let us catch our breath. Let us try to create a true immigration agency, one that can actually determine who is coming across our borders and how long they are here, and determine whether or not they are doing something when they are here that they should not be doing. Is that too much to ask for, really? Is it too much to ask for that we probably should not hand out 30 million visas a year, that we maybe should get rid of the diversity visas directed specifically at Middle Eastern countries? Is that too much to ask for?

I am not suggesting Ms. Coulter's remedy. I am saying that far from that, there are many things that we can do, but we must do something. It is incredibly irresponsible for us to ignore the reality here; and the reality is that there are people in this world who are intent upon our destruction. They hate us, Mr. Speaker, for reasons that go far beyond our foreign policy, far beyond the issue of Israel-United States-Palestinian relationships. They hate us because of who we are and what we stand for. Because we are the bastion of Judeo-Christian ideals, among those being the freedom to think.

This is not the kind of world, the one we represent is not the kind of world in which these people, these terrorists, are comfortable; nor is it one in which they can survive or thrive. Their brand of hijacked Islam can never survive in our kind of world, because our world puts them into the marketplace of ideas. It asks them to simply advance their ideas through that marketplace. They cannot survive in that arena. They know it. Therefore, they believe

that the only way to advance their cause is by the sword, just as it was centuries ago. This is a continuation of that failed concept, of conquest, of moving a religious issue by the sword. They are not unique in the world. It has happened before. There are many times in the world's history where we have seen this kind of thing happen. The fact is that we are dealing with it now, today, in America; and the perpetrators are fundamental, radical members of Islam, as a result of the fact that there are who-knows-how-many millions of people out there who have our destruction as their main purpose and goal in life.

Mr. Speaker, several things are important for us to do. One is to understand what I just said, that that is their intent. It is not to change our foreign policy, Mr. Speaker. It is not just to get a respite from the atrocities, from the conflict in the Middle East. It is not just an issue of the Palestinians versus the Israelis. It is far, far more serious than that, far deeper. As I say, its roots go back centuries.

Therefore, recognizing that we cannot change it simply by changing foreign policy; recognizing that the mechanisms that can be employed today to bring about our destruction are far more threatening than they ever have been in the history of mankind; recognizing that what happened on September 11 is probably just a teaser, and that the next event could very well be horrendously more devastating. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), the chairman of one of the House committees that deals with the issue of security, has said on this floor, said on television, I have seen him, I have heard him and he said more than once, that it is not a matter of if they are going to use weapons of mass destruction; it is a matter of when.

□ 2320

Knowing that, then, Mr. Speaker, why would I not do everything I can, stand up here at this microphone as often as I possibly can, to encourage, to cajole, to talk to this body about the importance of doing this one thing: gaining control of our borders. It is the only thing I can do. It is the only mechanism I have.

I can introduce the legislation, but I assure the Members, it will not pass. I assure Members it will not even be heard by the committee of reference because there is this kind of knee-jerk reaction to anything like this that it is too controversial, that we would make too many enemies in certain communities in this country.

How can we let these things guide our actions today, Mr. Speaker? How can we? It is more important than politics. It is more important than how many votes we are going to get at the next election from any particular ethnic group in the United States.

It is for every ethnic group in the United States that I plead. It is for every human being here, from whatever racial origin. It does not matter who they are, where they come from, but if they are here, if they are American citizens, it is they that I plead for.

I plead for their safety, for their security, for the security of every Mexican-American who just came here and came legally and is a member, or anybody who is even here illegally, it does not matter, I am pleading for their security. I choose not to identify any particular ethnic group.

I know every time we talk about immigration reform, it comes down to this thing. I have read in the paper attacks on me personally because I have called for immigration reform, and the suggestion the other day in the Denver paper, there was someone who wrote an editorial saying, why is he talking about reforming immigration? Why is he talking about shutting off the border? It was not Mexico that attacked the United States.

Of course it was not. Who said it was? It has nothing to do with Mexico; it has everything to do with porous borders between Mexico and the United States and between the United States and Canada, and the United States and the rest of the world. That is the problem. It is not any ethnic group. It is our inability to control our own destiny because of our inability and unwillingness to control our own borders.

Many philosophers have used the phrase "demography is destiny," many times. I agree. We have an ability to help control our destiny, but it means controlling our borders.

Mr. Speaker, I once again take this microphone and once again suggest that the only way we will ever get immigration reform through this body is for people to rise up and let the Members of this body know how they feel about it. They have to do it directly and quickly and vociferously, and they have to be unwavering in their commitment to get their point across that we desperately need true immigration reform.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. UNDERWOOD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today through October 9 on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GREEN of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BACA, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PENCE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LANGEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2510. An act to extend the expiration date of the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on October 1, 2001 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 2510. To extend the expiration date of the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 3, 2001, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3968. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Oklahoma [Docket No. 01-016-2] received September 4, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3969. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final

rule—Importation of Fruits and Vegetables [Docket No. 00-006-2] received September 4, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3970. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting His authorization to transfer from the Emergency Response Fund for emergency and national security activities; (H. Doc. No. 107-128); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3971. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting pursuant to the Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act, funds will be provided to the Department of Transportation's Compensation for Air Carriers account; (H. Doc. No. 107-129); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3972. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled, "Report on the Performance of Commercial Activities," pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3973. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Superintendent of Air Force Academy, Colorado, has conducted a cost comparison of the Civil Engineering, Department of Athletics Facilities, Dean of the Facility Facilities and Training Devices and 34th Training Wing Cadet Housing functions, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3974. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Commander of Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, has conducted a comparison study to reduce the cost of operating the Base Operating Support (BOS), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3975. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a Report on Proposed Obligations for Weapons Destruction and Non-Proliferation in the Former Soviet Union, pursuant to Public Law 104-106, section 1206(a) (110 Stat. 471); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3976. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of a study on certain function performed by military and civilian personnel in the Department of the Navy for possible performance by private contractors, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3977. A letter from the Director, Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Department of Defense, transmitting a Report on Conversion of Department of Defense Commercial Activity to a Private Contractor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3978. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on Strategic and Competitive Sourcing Programs Workforce Review Cost Savings Report for FY 2000; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3979. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Review of Acquisition Plans for Conventional Ammunition [DFARS Case 2000-D030] received September 4, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3980. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; DoD Pilot Mentor-Protégé Program [DFARS